

## Minutes of the Property Committee Meeting

The Property Committee of the McLean County Board met on Thursday, May 2, 2002 at 4:00 p.m. in Room 700, Law and Justice Center, 104 West Front Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

Members Present: Chairman Salch, Members Bostic, Hoselton, Nuckolls, Selzer and Owens

Members Absent: None

Other Board Members Present: None

Staff Present: Mr. John M. Zeunik, County Administrator; Ms. Martha B. Ross, County Administrator's Assistant

Department Heads/  
Elected Officials Present: Mr. Jack Moody, Director, Facilities Management;  
Mr. Bill Wasson, Director, Parks and Recreation Department;  
Ms. Karen Swick, Accounting Specialist, Highway Department, on behalf of Mr. Jack Mitchell, County Engineer

Other Staff Present: Mr. Sammy Ferrara, Superintendent, Veteran's Assistance Commission

Chairman Salch called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Chairman Salch presented the minutes of the April 2, 2002 meeting. Hearing no corrections or additions to the minutes, Chairman Salch declared the minutes of the April 2, 2002 meeting of the Property Committee to be approved as submitted.

Ms. Karen Swick, Accounting Specialist with the McLean County Highway Department, stated that the Highway Department is requesting approval of service agreements with SimplexGrinnell LP for the security and fire alarms located at the Highway Department's physical plant. She noted that the alarms have been in service for approximately 18 months. It was thought that there was already a service agreement in effect, but it was determined that there is no agreement at the present time.

Motion by Hoselton/Nuckolls to Recommend Approval of the Service Agreements with SimplexGrinnell LP for the Security and Fire Alarm Systems at the Highway Department Facility.

Mr. Owens asked whether service agreements were executed at the time the security and fire systems were put in place. Mr. Zeunik responded that each unit carried a one-year warranty.

Motion carried.

Mr. Jack Moody, Director, Facilities Management, presented the proposal from Wiss, Janney, Elstner, Inc. ("WJE") for work to be done at the Old Courthouse site. He introduced Mr. Jeff Koerber, Historical Architect, WJE, who addressed questions from the Committee regarding the proposal.

Mr. Selzer thanked all involved with finalizing the provisions of the WJE proposal. He noted that this was a somewhat arduous process.

Mr. Hoselton asked what the \$66,000 and \$24,000 charges specifically entailed. Mr. Koerber responded that the \$66,000 charge covers the scope of work that is delineated within the proposal. The \$24,000 covers the expense of support services needed in order to execute the work.

Chairman Salch asked, in the event that the Property Committee approves the WJE proposal, would it then be submitted to the full County Board for final approval. Mr. Zeunik responded that it would.

Chairman Salch then asked, assuming approval by the full County Board, how long would it be before WJE could begin work at the site. Mr. Zeunik noted that the Board meets on May 21, 2002, which would be the date of proposed final approval. If the proposal is approved at that time, work could potentially begin immediately thereafter.

Mr. Hoselton asked how the roof for the Old Courthouse will be addressed with regard to the provisions of the proposal. Mr. Koerber stated that the roof was considered as a part of the previous preliminary inspection, which was meant to determine proposed cost figures for long term repairs on the building. At that time, the roof was not part of the design services offered by WJE.

Mr. Koerber noted that the scope of work which is outlined in the proposal being considered by the Committee involves investigative work which will ultimately determine WJE's recommendations for repairs to the Old Courthouse Building. Mr. Moody stated that at the time recommendations are made, and biddable documents become available, those documents will be reviewed by the Property Committee.

Mr. Selzer asked that Mr. Hoselton be called to come on site when roof inspections are conducted, so that he may personally observe the conditions that exist. Mr. Koerber stated that the appropriate people would be notified prior to the commencement of such work.

Motion by Hoselton/Selzer to Recommend Approval of the Contract with Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc. for Pre-Renovation Inspection Work to be Done on the Old Courthouse. Motion carried.

Mr. Moody presented a request for replacement of the existing Data-Aire Unit located at the Old Courthouse. The unit is a dry cooler unit, which eliminates humidity in the air, thereby protecting a variety of rare artifacts in the collections stored and displayed at the Old Courthouse. The current unit was installed eleven years ago during the initial renovation of the building.

Mr. Moody explained that provisions have been made in the Fiscal Year 2002 budget to replace the Date-Aire Unit. The approved dollar amount is \$28,300 to replace the unit. He further explained that the replacement unit must be a Data-Aire unit in order to maintain full warranty on both the unit and installation. The only company in the State of Illinois that deals with Data-Aire is Brucker Company of Peoria, Illinois. Mr. Moody remarked that the County has had experience with this firm and found them to be satisfactory.

Mr. Nuckolls asked what are the warranty provisions on the new unit. Mr. Moody responded that the warranty is for a term of one year.

Mr. Owens asked how long it would take to install the new unit. Mr. Moody responded that once a purchase order is submitted to initiate the order, the new unit should arrive within three to four weeks.

Mr. Owens then asked how long the interim time period would be between the removal of the old unit and the installation of the new unit. Mr. Moody noted that the building would be without any Date-Aire service for approximately one week. Therefore, the timing of the installation of the new unit should be planned when the weather is as dry as possible.

Mr. Owens asked what is the life span of a Data-Aire unit. Mr. Moody stated that the current unit was installed in 1991. He noted that it would be reasonable to expect a service life of at least 10 years, even though the unit is meant to run continuously from the time it is switched on.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether there was any trade in allowance give for the old unit. Mr. Moody stated that there was no such program available and the current unit had no trade in value. Its useful life has been expended.

Motion by Owens/Bostic to recommend approval of the purchase and installation of a new Data-Aire Unit to be located at the Old Courthouse. Motion carried.

Mr. Selzer asked what the Historical Society pays in rent per month. Mr. Moody responded that the monthly amount is \$833.33, or just under \$10,000 per year.

Mr. Moody presented a request to approve a new elevator contract for the Government Center Building. He explained that currently, the County is paying for the monthly service agreement invoices, pursuant to a contract between Long Elevator and the City of Bloomington. The County is not named as a party in this contract, but pays the invoices.

In January 2002, all of the regular utility bills and expense bills to operate the building began to be paid from the County's budget. Therefore, the County has chosen to reassess the elevator contract. Three area elevator companies were solicited to submit quotes for service, routine maintenance, and required annual testing and certification for the elevators that are located in the Government Center Building.

The three (3) elevator companies solicited are: Long Elevator; KONE Elevator (formerly Montgomery); and, ThyssenKrupp Elevator (formerly Dover Elevator). Each company's representative was given a tour of the elevator facilities in the building, and was asked to submit a proposal for the County's review. Long Elevator did not change their dollar amount, which remains at \$1,080.00 per month. KONE Elevator quoted \$900.00 per month for like service. ThyssenKrupp Elevator submitted a quote of \$735.00 per month.

Each firm was contacted and interviewed individually. References for ThyssenKrupp were contacted, and it was revealed that they have an excellent record with regard to installation and service. Mr. Moody recommended that the Property Committee approve and recommend to the County Board the ThyssenKrupp elevator service agreement proposal for the fee of \$735.00 per month for a 12-month term. The new service agreement would then become effective, negating the current agreement with Long Elevator.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether monthly elevator inspections are conducted by ThyssenKrupp. Mr. Moody responded that they would inspect as routinely as needed. Routine and annual safety checks must be performed. The elevators located in the Government Center Building would be placed on the regular monthly inspection sheet for a variety of things that Facilities Management staff is not qualified to do. ThyssenKrupp must also work with the City of Bloomington's Office of Elevator Safety and Inspection on many routine items. On site service and repair will be a part of the service agreement contract.

Mr. Owens asked whether the City of Bloomington has continued to pay anything toward the elevator service agreement. Mr. Moody remarked that the County began paying for those charges as of January 1, 2002, when responsibility for such maintenance payments passed to the County. He explained that while the name has been changed on the invoices, the underlying contractual agreement was made between Long Elevator and the City of Bloomington.

Mr. Nuckolls asked whether the service agreement with ThyssenKrupp Elevator covers both routine maintenance checks as well as service calls for repairs. Mr. Moody responded that this is a regular service agreement that covers all phases of repair and maintenance. All inspections are covered between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. as long as interruptions in service are not the fault of the operator.

Motion by Nuckolls/Bostic to Recommend Approval of the Service Agreement Contract with ThyssenKrupp Elevator Company for maintenance and service to the elevators in the Government Center Building.

Mr. Owens asked whether the contract between Long Elevator and the City of Bloomington would expire in the near future. Mr. Moody stated that the current service agreement contract term expires at the end of December 2002. However, the County cannot be expected to honor the terms of a contract to which it is not a party.

Motion carried.

Mr. Moody presented a request received from Uniquely Bloomington ("UB!") to install holiday lights at the Old Courthouse. He explained that, as a result of a project done in a prior year, an additional electrical meter was installed to monitor costs for additional outdoor lights during the holiday season, keeping those charges separate from the other electrical usage in the facility.

Mr. Moody noted that Mr. Greg Koos, Executive Director of the McLean County Museum of History, is amenable to the holiday lights display. Uniquely Bloomington! will be responsible for upkeep and maintenance of the lights during the time that they are displayed. UB! will also put up and take down the display, so that there will be no involvement by the County's Facilities staff.

Motion by Selzer/Owens to recommend approval of a holiday lights display by Uniquely Bloomington! at the Old Courthouse during the 2002 holiday season. Motion carried.

Mr. Bill Wasson, Director, Parks and Recreation Department, presented a request for approval of a Telephone Maintenance Service Contract with Verizon for the five (5) buildings at

COMLARA Park. He noted that the current warranty had expired. The new contract will cover the nine desktop and wall-mounted telephones, a voice mail system and an information system, which is included in the proposed contract. Also as a part of the contract agreement, Verizon maintains nearly three-fourths mile of underground cable, which may be subject to repairs. Mr. Wasson stated that the Parks and Recreation Department recommends approval of the Verizon service agreement on an annual basis for \$640.92.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether all nine telephones were covered by the proposed service agreement. Mr. Wasson responded that the service agreement covers the entire system, including all the telephone units, information system and voice mail.

Mr. Selzer asked if both parts and labor were covered by the agreement. Mr. Wasson responded that the agreement is inclusive, but covers the workday only. He specified that it is a workday contract, which is in force from Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. He noted that the office does have a single line telephone that can be utilized in emergencies.

Mr. Nuckolls asked whether the proposed contract is a continuation of the contract agreement which is currently in force. Mr. Wasson responded affirmatively.

Motion by Nuckolls/Selzer to recommend approval of a telephone maintenance contract with Verizon for COMLARA Park.  
Motion carried.

Mr. Wasson presented a request to apply for a grant with the National Tree Trust. The grant would be for community tree planting. Mr. Wasson explained that this program has been available for several years. However, the most important feature that is expected to be offered is that of tree seedling protection via the use of tree tubes.

Mr. Wasson remarked that the COMLARA Park facility experiences significant deer browse, especially during the time that vulnerable tree seedlings are being started. The tree tubes are expected to shield the seedlings from extensive damage, which will ensure the survival of many more seedlings.

The grant offers a cost share feature, which will maximize the Parks and Recreation Department's efforts to reforest the area. Volunteer labor will be utilized for planting, as well as budgeted funds for tree planting, in order to meet the 50/50 in-kind cost share requirement in the grant.

Mr. Wasson commented that a fairly low number of seedlings will be planted at the outset. However, it is hoped that if the tree tube protection is successful, and it is then offered in subsequent years, the program will be expanded.

Chairman Salch asked for a description of the tree tubes that will be utilized in the program. Mr. Wasson answered that the tubes are translucent, and fit over the seedlings after they are planted. The translucency of the tubes, along with the open top of each tube, allows the infusion of sunlight and moisture to the seedlings. At the same time, the seedlings are protected from the deer browse, which occurs heavily in the area.

Chairman Salch asked how high the seedlings are when they are planted and the tubes are put into place. Mr. Wasson noted that the seedlings are 2-2.5 feet above ground level when they are received. The tree tubes are between 1.5-2 feet in height, and many are anticipated to need extensions this year in order to accommodate the seedling growth. This will increase the seedling survival rate.

Chairman Salch asked why bur oak and shagbark hickory seedlings were selected for the program. Mr. Wasson responded that those are tree species that grow very well in dry soil conditions. In the areas that will be planted, the soil conditions will be drier and not near surface water sources. The areas are primarily former agricultural areas that are being reforested. He noted that there were other tree species which were preferred, but those were not offered on the list of species from which grant applicants could choose.

Chairman Salch remarked that the bur oak and shagbark hickory are both slow growing species. Mr. Wasson concurred. However, he noted that both species have good longevity.

Motion by Owens/Bostic to recommend approval of a grant from the National Tree Trust for Community Tree Planting, for the COMLARA Park facility. Motion carried.

Mr. Wasson reported that the Highway Department has recently received a report from the State of Illinois regarding Route 66 Preliminary Engineering, Design I Phase. Hanson Engineers has started some preliminary work. The Parks and Recreation Department is working with the Highway Department because the project is essentially a transportation project. Mr. Wasson noted that the Parks Department will assist with the implementation of a billing cycle with all of the communities covered by the Intergovernmental Agreement for the cost shares involved with the project.

Mr. Wasson remarked that the camping facility at COMLARA Park had approximately 40 people already in line at midnight on the first Saturday in April, to get reservations for camping.

Additionally, the boat rental facility is now open for the summer.

Mr. Selzer commented under the agenda category of "Other," regarding a recent newspaper article that appeared in The Pantagraph. The article was a report on a local bank robbery and the lack of notification provided to County law enforcement. He stated that he has ongoing questions regarding security at the MetCom Building.

Mr. Selzer stated that in March, 2001, Mr. Bill Gamblin, Administrator of the E-911 project, came before the Property Committee to request an upgrade in safety measures for the MetCom facility. Mr. Selzer reported that at a meeting of the Property Committee held on March 1, 2001,

Mr. Gamblin presented an urgent need for bullet-resistant doors on that facility. Mr. Selzer, citing the meeting minutes, noted that the Committee requested a mock inspection of the facility so that any other security problems could be identified and addressed. In the minutes, Mr. Gamblin was noted to say that the Emergency Telephone Systems Board (the "ETSB") was fortunate to be acquainted with a former employee of the Illinois Commerce Commission (the "ICC"), who was now employed by Verizon in Bloomington. Mr. Selzer stated that it was understood that the former ICC employee was to again inspect the facility to insure that there were no other issues that needed to be considered.

Mr. Selzer referred to his comments in the March 1, 2001 Property Committee meeting minutes, and noted that the bullet-resistant doors alone were insufficient if windows were not protected in a like manner. Mr. Selzer remarked that Mr. Gamblin had assured the Committee that he would explore the issue of enhanced security at the MetCom Building, and return to the Committee with his report. Mr. Selzer commented that more than a year has elapsed without further contact from Mr. Gamblin. He stated that no one is holding Mr. Gamblin accountable for the lapse in timely contact with the Committee on the security issue for the MetCom Building.

Mr. Selzer stated that several members of the ETSB Board, who are appointed by the County Board, are versed in security issues. He noted that concern for the safety of the employees who work in the MetCom facility should be more of a priority for the ETSB Board. In the event that security in that facility is breached and employees' safety is compromised, the County could become a Defendant in one or more lawsuits. Therefore, Mr. Gamblin should be strongly encouraged to be accountable to the ETSB Board and the Property Committee as to why it was previously so urgent that bullet-resistant doors be installed in the MetCom facility, only to have that request lose momentum, with no action taken for over a year.

Ms. Bostic asked whether the bullet-resistant doors were ever installed. Mr. Selzer remarked that, at one point, the Facilities Management Department was asked to install the doors in order save money on installation costs. However, he did not specify whether the doors were actually installed.

Mr. Selzer commented that, as elected officials who represent McLean County residents, the members of the Committee, and indeed, the full County Board, is responsible for the oversight of the MetCom facility. He stated that if the building does not comply with current ICC regulations, the facility should be shut down until compliance can be achieved.

Mr. Owens asked why the bullet-resistant doors were not installed. Mr. Selzer responded that Committee action was taken to allow the installation, appropriate the funding, and schedule a mock inspection. Mr. Selzer noted that the Committee was also informed that the proposed estimate for the cost of the project could change according to the cost of the bids.

Ms. Bostic asked whether any bids were ever presented to the Property Committee. Mr. Selzer responded that a motion was made by Ms. Bostic and seconded by Mr. Nuckolls to approve an amount up to \$20,000.00 for modifications to the MetCom facility to comply with ICC regulations. Mr. Selzer repeated his admonition that if the building does not currently comply with ICC regulations, it should be closed. He stated that since all local law enforcement agencies have their own radio systems anyway, the service provided by MetCom may not be missed.

Mr. Selzer remarked that none of the three (3) largest governmental agencies in the County have any control over the operation of ETSB, even though the County Board approves appointments to the ETSB Board. He stated emphatically that the County needs to gain control over the operation of the facility. He also stated that Mr. Gamblin should provide a progress report on the doors to the Property Committee at its regular June 2002 meeting.

Chairman Salch remarked that one month's time may not be sufficient for Mr. Gamblin to prepare a report to the Committee. Mr. Zeunik remarked that one month's time should be sufficient for this type of report.

Chairman Salch stated that the Property Committee cannot take any action on the issue at this time because it was not placed on the Committee's May 2002 agenda as an item for action. Mr. Selzer responded that he would like the issue placed on the Property Committee's June 2002 agenda as an action item and that Mr. Gamblin should appear personally to give the report.

Mr. Selzer remarked that since this is a new budget year, Mr. Gamblin may not even have the authority to enter into a contract in order to commence the work. He would need to return to the Property Committee for authorization. Mr. Selzer stated that he wants an action item to appear on the June 2002 Property Committee agenda, which will address the issue of the MetCom facility's compliance with ICC regulations or face closure.

Minutes of the Property Committee Meeting

May 2, 2002

Page Ten

Mr. Owens stated he was surprised to hear that, following the Committee's authorization for the bullet-resistant doors to be installed, there was no action taken, and no subsequent report to the Committee as to the reason for postponing the installation. Mr. Selzer commented that the lack of accountability to the Committee is a serious problem that needs to be addressed.

Chairman Salch asked who is the owner of the MetCom facility. Mr. Zeunik responded that the facility is owned by the Public Building Commission (the "PBC") until 2006-2007. The County leases the building from the PBC.

Mr. Zeunik explained that originally, Mr. Gamblin approached the Facilities Management staff to have the doors installed pursuant to a County Work Order. Mr. Jack Moody, Director, Facilities Management, met with Mr. Gamblin on site and reviewed the scope of the proposed project. Mr. Moody determined that the job was not a maintenance issue, but rather it was a major structural change to the building. That change required an architect and an engineer to examine the as-built drawings and prepare detailed specifications, in accordance with the Commerce Commission's guidelines. In the event that there are any questions regarding how the project was done, it can be clearly shown that the project was done in accordance with ICC Regulations.

Mr. Zeunik noted that Mr. Moody's recommendation was to have the project approved by the Property Committee, by virtue of the scope of work needed, the dollar amount involved, and the PBC's ownership of the building.

Mr. Selzer noted that Chairman Salch had posed the question of why the bullet-resistant doors were not installed at the time of construction, in order to comply with code specifications during the March 2001 meeting. He explained that Mr. Gamblin had responded that he would check into it. It was undetermined, following the building's construction, whether the County's plans were insufficient or whether the builder simply did not follow plans that included the doors. Mr. Selzer remarked that determining ownership of liability is at stake.

Chairman Salch stated that the PBC should be included in the discussions regarding the MetCom facility.

Mr. Selzer explained that he perceives the problem to be one of authority. There is no one entity in charge. He stated that Mr. Gamblin has one board to whom he reports, while Ms. Shawn Walker, Director, MetCom, has another board to whom she reports.

Chairman Salch asked who receives the money that is collected from the surcharge on telephone bills, that is to fund the E-911 System. Mr. Zeunik stated that the surcharge amount of \$1.25 per line and the \$0.75 per wireless phone is sent to the Emergency Telephone Systems Board. That

Minutes of the Property Committee Meeting  
May 2, 2002  
Page Eleven

Board controls how the money is spent. One encumbrance on that money is the debt service on the bonds that the PBC sold. There is no County money involved with the ETSB.

Mr. Zeunik explained that County money is involved in MetCom because the formation of MetCom was pursuant to the provisions of an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Bloomington, the Town of Normal, the County of McLean, and the ETSB.

Ms. Bostic asked whether funding for MetCom came out of the tax levy on the local citizens. Mr. Zeunik responded that it is a budgeted expense in the County Board's budget. Therefore, the County must fund MetCom as a part of its annual operating budget.

Mr. Selzer stated that, in addition to the MetCom facility issue, the McLean County Sheriff has requested that the County provide a new radio system for use by the officers in the field. This will significantly impact the County's already tight budget.

Mr. Hoselton remarked that the change to a 400 MHz radio system will create some difficulty for many of the smaller towns within the County, since they have already invested in the 800 MHz radio system. He noted that one of the manufacturer's recommendations to improve service was to add more antennae. Mr. Hoselton stated that additional antennae need not be constructed. Rather, tall structures that are already in place, such as grain elevators, could be utilized without further expenditures for new towers.

Mr. Selzer asked how much was paid for the study, which was done to determine how to mitigate the problems in the transmissions with the 800 MHz system. Mr. Zeunik responded that there were actually four (4) studies done. The most recent was free of charge because it was conducted by an office within the United States Department of Justice. Their recommendation, as a result of the study, was to retain the 800 MHz system, which is already in place. However, more towers are needed for radio transmissions. The system was not designed properly at the outset, and it still does not meet minimum standards for use by a law enforcement agency.

Mr. Zeunik stated that there has been some resistance to the 800 MHz system because it was perceived that a myriad of new towers would have to be erected as a part of the system. However, new towers are not necessary if there are already other permanent structures in place that can be utilized. Water towers and grain elevators are examples of alternative permanent structures that could be utilized as tower structures for the radio system.

Mr. Zeunik remarked that one of the top priorities in utilizing the new system was to remove equipment from the large tower located in middle of downtown Bloomington. This became necessary due to the incessant interference with law enforcement transmissions by the transmissions of commercial providers. Most notable among the commercial providers currently sharing tower space is Nextel, one of the largest users of the 800 MHz frequency at this time.

Minutes of the Property Committee Meeting

May 2, 2002

Page Twelve

However, the equipment has not yet been removed from the tower, so the troublesome interference is ongoing.

Ms. Bostic asked whether the problem lies with the ETSB and MetCom Boards, who have not pursued the mitigation suggestions that have been made. Mr. Zeunik stated that the Justice Committee generally is of the opinion that the problem should be addressed by the ETSB Board, which made the initial decision to move to an 800 MHz system and hired a consultant to write the bid specifications and engineering specifications. When the vendors who intended to bid on the 800 MHz system advised the Board that the system, as it was designed, was insufficient, they were told to bid on what information they received. Bids were awarded based upon the information that was then received.

Mr. Selzer asked whether there was a study done in the recent past, wherein money was paid to the original vendor for further work. Mr. Zeunik responded that MetCom paid EF Johnson to do a propagation study, specifically looking at what type of modifications need to be made. The result of that study confirmed what was already known regarding the shortcomings of the present system. Also, EF Johnson offered to install additional receiver antennas, and provide independent testing, at no initial cost to the County, in order to prove that system will work more efficiently. If that action proves unsatisfactory, EF Johnson would remove the equipment at no cost to the County. Conversely, if radio reception and transmission were improved by the addition of the extra equipment, EF Johnson would then bill the County for the equipment. The benefit would be that the County could attempt to improve the inadequate radio system without an additional cash outlay until a determination of benefit is made.

Mr. Hoselton asked who originally designed the 800 MHz radio system. He asked whether the designer had been approached with regard to the flaws in the original design. Mr. Selzer noted that the original designer recommended 8-9 towers for the radio system, and the ETSB Board altered that number, stating that it could only afford three towers.

Chairman Salch presented the bills, which have been reviewed and recommended for transmittal to the Property Committee by the County Auditor.

Motion by Selzer/Owens to recommend payment of the bills as presented by the County Auditor. Motion carried.

Minutes of the Property Committee Meeting  
May 2, 2002  
Page Thirteen

Motion by Hoselton/Nuckolls to adjourn. Motion carried.

There being nothing further to come before the Committee at this time, Chairman Salch adjourned the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha B. Ross  
Recording Secretary

E:\Ann\Min\P\_May.02